

11

LUC-414/Graske 1-2-6

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-26 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Number 6,560,456 issued to Lohtia et al. on May 6, 2003 in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,351,647 issued to Gustafsson on February 26, 2002, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0006912 issued to Brescia dated January 9, 2003.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

First, applicants assert that even if it were proper to combine the cited references, the resulting combination would not make obvious applicants' claims. This is because neither Lohtia nor Gustafsson nor Brescia teach or suggest applicants' claim 1, as amended, that now recite,

"receiving, at a weather alert notification component, a short message service (SMS) request from a mobile station to receive one or more notifications of any one or more weather alerts that occur during a time period;

registering the mobile station with the weather alert notification component upon receipt of the SMS request from the mobile station;

determining a location of the mobile station upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period; and

sending a notification of a weather alert, of the one or more notifications of the any one or more weather alerts, to the mobile station upon an occurrence of the weather alert during the time period; and

evaluating a history of weather alerts received by the weather alert notification component to determine if the weather alerts were previously issued for a new location of the mobile station when the mobile station travels from the location to the new location."

As stated in the Office Action, the Examiner agrees that Lohtia does not teach "registering the mobile station with the weather alert notification component upon receipt

of the SMS request from the mobile station". Also, the Examiner agrees that Lohtia and Gustafsson do not teach "determining a location of the mobile station upon the occurrence of the any one or more weather alerts during the time period" either.

Second, applicants agree that Brescia's technique determines a location of the mobile station upon the occurrence of a weather alert. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Brescia does not teach or suggest "evaluating a history of weather alerts received by the weather alert notification component to determine if the weather alerts were previously issued for a new location of the mobile station when the mobile station travels from the location to the new location", as recited in applicants' claim 1. This is because Brescia monitors event triggers and location indicia in light of criteria in existing profiles, as stated in paragraph 0036. Thus, Brescia is missing the element "evaluating a history of weather alerts received by the weather alert notification component to determine if the weather alerts were previously issued for a new location of the mobile station when the mobile station travels from the location to the new location".

Third, applicants assert that Lohtia and Gustafsson do not teach or suggest "evaluating a history of weather alerts", either.

Thus, the clear teaching of Lohtia with Gustafsson and Brescia is that a history of weather alerts received by the weather alert notification component is not evaluated to determine if the weather alerts were previously issued for a new location of the mobile station when the mobile station travels from the location to the new location.

Therefore the combination of Lohtia with Gustafsson and Brescia does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-11 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claims 12 and 26 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by the combination of Lohtia with Gustafsson and Brescia. For example, claims 12 and 26 recite, "wherein the weather alert notification component evaluates a history of weather alerts received by the weather alert notification component to determine if the weather alerts were previously issued for a new location of the mobile station when the mobile station travels from the location to the new location". The combination of Lohtia with Gustafsson and Brescia

13

LUC-414/Graske 1-2-6

does not teach this limitation for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 12 and 26 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 13-25 depend from claim 12, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Claim Amendment

Claim 9 was amended to add the term "and". No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: June 1, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382